AN

ABSTRACT

OF

Common Principles

OF A

Juſt Vindication

OF THE

RIGHTS

O-F THE

Kingdom of God

Upon EARTH,

Againſt the

Politick Machinations of *Eraſtian* Hereticks;

Out of the

Vindication of the Deprived Biſhops, &c.

By a very Learned Man of the Church of *England.*

LONDON,

Printed, *Anno Domini*, 1700.

THE PREFACE.

THE Kingdom of God upon Earth *is in its Institution, and in its own Nature, really a Glorious Kingdom, tho', through the ill Administration of those to whom it hath been committed, it hath never yet appeared in its true and proper Lustre, and at present not only seems to be, but really is in a divided, shattered, and dejected condition. God in great Wisdom doth very often with great Bodies of Men, as he doth with particular Persons, put them to School to the Mistress of Fools, leave them to eat the Fruit of their own doings, and to learn Wisdom by their own Experience; to experiment and even feel the Insufficiency of Humane Powers, the Deceitfulness of Humane Wisdom, the Malice, Subtilty and Power of their Invisible Adversaries, and the Abundance of his Goodness, the Infallibility of his Wisdom, and the Irresistibility of his Power; and their own intire Dependancy upon Him, and absolute need of continual Supply of all these from Him, and of constant Subjection and Conformity thereunto. If Men would therefore at last, after so long Experience, open their Eyes, lift up their Heads, and well consider the Admirable Wisdom of his Divine Institution, the Excellent Accommodation of it for the Good and Benefit of Mankind, and of all Degrees, Orders, States, and Conditions amongst them; and how and by what Ways and Means it hath come to pass that the World hath been so little sensible of, and received no more Benefit from so powerful and effectual a Divine Favour, as the Institution of this Kingdom is, and would have produced long since, had it been improved as it might; and duly consider, every one in his place, but especially they who are in chief Places in Church or State, what the* Interest *of this blessed Kingdom, and the glorious King thereof, do require of all, and of themselves in particular, for their own Good, and the common Good of all, and then, without more a-do, apply themselves with full Resolution to order all their Actions in Conformity thereunto, and to approve their* Fidelity *to their Soveraign and his Interest, as becomes Good Subjects, they would soon perceive and receive*

the

the Benefit thereof, and behold it in its Glory. And tho' there is at present little appearance of any such Disposition in those, who are first in place, that they will be forwardest in such Actions, yet whoever will heartily do their part in this, as there is none but may do something, so there is nothing that they can do so mean, if they do all they can, but will obtain a Glorious Reward, far above all this World can afford. But it will require no little Courage, Generosity, Magnanimity *and* Constancy *to perform it: for such is the Nature and Terms of* true Loyalty *in this Kingdom, as will shake off Multitudes of Pretenders, when they come for Admittance. Yet it is, in short, but first to dispose themselves for the receiving of Truth, and then, when fairly proposed, cordially imbrace it, own and profess it, stick to it, and act accordingly. For the first of these there is lately printed a short* Recipe: *and some of the most important and fundamental Truths for this purpose are here treated in the following* ABSTRACT *by a very Learned Man of the* Church of England *established by Law, and a great and zealous Champion for it. It is true, it is but an Abstract, but an* Abstract *of what is very hard to be met with, and of the very Marrow of it, the rest being only critical Learning, of little or no use to the greatest part of even intelligent Readers; but only for Scholars, and such as are curious in Matters of little moment. And for such as desire to see more to this purpose, they may have recourse to a Learned Book of* the Sinfulness and Mischief of Schism, *in 4o. and another in 8vo. of* One Altar, and One Priesthood, *besides a special Learned* Defence of this Vindication, *much more common to be had than the* Vindication *it self.*

More was intended concerning this Kingdom, *and the* true Subjects *of it, for the proper* Use *and* Application *of this Catholick Doctrine; but because it may be more seasonable when the Doctrine hath been received and digested, it may be sufficient here to add only this* Admonition: *That* Separation from Separatists *is no Separation from the* One Body *and* Unity *of this Kingdom: Nor is* Visible *or* Episcopal *inconsistent with Schismatical; but a* Schismatical Communion *may be really both, and hath been heretofore; nay, most* visible *in the same City or Country, and truly* Episcopal, (*tho' what is not so cannot but be Schismatical*) *and, besides all this,* Established by Law.

Common

Common Principles

Of a juſt Vindication of the

Rights of the Kingdom of God

Upon EARTH, &c.

CHAP. I.

That for Clergy-Men *to appear in a Cauſe deſtructive of the Intereſt of* Religion *in general, and of their own* Function *in particular, is inexcuſable.*

THAT the *Laity* ſhould be favourable to Miſtakes derogatory to the *Sacred* Power, cannot be thought ſtrange in an Age wherein they generally uſe ſo little Diligence to inform themſelves, or to receive Information from thoſe who are qualified to inform them, concerning the Rights of the *Clergy*: Their own Intereſts are alone ſufficient to make them *partial* in affairs of this nature, tho' they were more ſincerely influenced by Conſiderations of Religion, than we generally find them: But that *Clergy-Men* ſhould alſo favour them in Incroachments on their *own Function*; that *they* ſhould profeſſedly patronize Doctrines tending to leſſen the Eſteem of that *greateſt and moſt valuable of all Authorities* wherewith God has honoured and intruſted none but *them*; that they ſhould make it depend on the *Pleaſure* of the *Magiſtrate*, which was deſigned for greater and more noble Ends than the *Magiſtracy* it ſelf; that they ſhould put it in his Power to deſtroy the very *Being* of the Church, as a *Society*,

by a ſecular Deprivation; that they ſhould not only *Own*, but *Teach*, That none are obliged to adhere to *themſelves* in ſuch a Caſe wherein the *Magiſtrate is againſt them*, no not ſo much as in regard of *Conſcience*; that they ſhould by this means make the *greateſt and moſt momentous Concerns for Souls* ſubordinate to *Worldly*, *Carnal* Politicks, and the far leſs weighty Intereſts of *Worldly* Proſperity, and of *particular* Societies; that they ſhould hereby make it *leaſt* capable of ſubſiſting under a *Perſecution*, which was the Caſe moſt obvious in the View of our Bleſſed *Saviour* and his *Apoſtles*, and therefore moſt particularly provided for, if they took care for any thing beyond their own time: Theſe things, I ſay, would not be very credible, if they were not very notorious. One would think none who valued the general good of *Religion*, and the *Catholick Church*, and the *Souls* of Mankind, before the temporal Proſperity of any particular State, (and it is hard to conceive how any good Man can do otherwiſe) could even *wiſh* ſuch Opinions true, tho' his *Wiſh* alone were ſufficient to make them ſo. How then is it agreeable, that *Clergy-Men* of all Men ſhould be the moſt favourable and zealous *Advocates* for ſuch Opinions, ſo manifeſtly deſtructive of thoſe greateſt Intereſts, which they of all Men ought beſt to underſtand, and to be moſt zealouſly concerned for? How is it agreeable, that they of all Men cannot be content to let the *Memory* of *ill Preſidents* die, but that they muſt alarm us with future Fears of having them acted again by not only *Abetting*, but alſo *Juſtifying* them? How is it agreeable, that they ſhould do this in a *Proſpect*, ſuch as ours is, of a *Laity* ſo little *concerned* for the Good of *Religion*, and the *Church*; when even they who have any Principles, have ſuch *lax* ones, and ſo very little obliging them, even in *Conſcience*, to venture any thing for any *particular Communion*? That their preferring their *Worldly* Concerns, depending on the Pleaſure of the *Magiſtrate*, before the *greater* Concerns of *Souls*, and *Eternity*, is the true Cauſe of it, is not to be believed, while there are any *Reaſons* that might induce them to it. Yet *little Reaſons* cannot in *Equity* excuſe, when the *Conſequences* ought to be ſo very *valuable* on that very account of *Mens* being either *Good* or *Religious*. Much leſs when the Conſequences of the Principles on which they proceed are ſuch in reſpect to the *Publick Intereſts* even of their own Church, as put it in the Power of a *Popiſh* or *Schiſmatical* Prince (and even of a *ſecret Infidel* or *Apoſtate*) to diſſolve it when they pleaſe. Suppoſe a *Popiſh Prince*,

Prince, with a *Popiſh Parliament*, ſhould turn their Principles (that is, the Principles of theſe Men) againſt themſelves, and deprive all our *Biſhops* with one Act of *State*, I cannot ſee what theſe Fathers can pretend to ſecure their *Church*, as a *Society*, and as a *Communion*, in Oppoſition to them. They muſt no longer pretend to *Dioceſſes* in *England*. They muſt not pretend to any *Obligation* of their *Proteſtant Clergy* and *Laity* to ſtand by them, even in *Conſcience*. They muſt therefore never pretend to *Communions* in *thoſe Dioceſſes*, which are plainly *Exerciſes* of *Spiritual Authority* in them. Nor can they then juſtifie, or even excuſe, any *Aſſemblies* for *Religion*, when forbidden by the *Civil* Magiſtrate, who is *only* ſuppoſed, by *theſe* Principles, to have alſo the *Right* to that *Spiritual* Authority by which *alone* they can be juſtified. And are theſe the ways to *ſecure* our *Religion* againſt *Popery*? No open *Perſecutions* whatſoever can ever ruine us ſo effectually as theſe *Doctrines* will, if ever we receive them. *Doctrines* of our *own* will break our *Union* among our *ſelves*, more than any of our Adverſaries open Violencies.

CHAP. II.

That the Church of Chriſt *is not to be conſidered meerly as a* Sect, *but as a* Sacred Society; *and that its being a* Society *is a Fundamental Doctrine.*

MEN (amongſt us in this and the laſt Age) have hitherto conſidered the *Church* rather as a *Sect*, than as a *Society*; and have therefore uſually had no regard to the *Doctrines Fundamental* to it as a *Society*, if they did not withall concern it as a *Sect*, and *Antecedently* to its being a *Society*. But there ſeems very little Reaſon for their doing ſo, if they will be pleaſed impartially to reflect on it. It is very true, its Notion as a *Sect* is *antecedent* to its being a *Society*, becauſe it is a *Society* into which Men find themſelves obliged to enter by the *Doctrines* they muſt be ſuppoſed to believe, if they own it as a *Sect*. But even thence it appears, that the *Doctrines* which concern it as a *Sect*, do withall make it *neceſſary* it ſhould be a *Society*. Theſe two Conſiderations therefore are by

no means to be ſeparated. Nay, it hence appears, that the *Doctrines* conſtituting it as a *Sect*, do alſo by a near, and unavoidable, and evident *Conſequence*, make it a *Society*. Thus therefore the *Fundamentals* of its being a *Society*, will be included in that *Syſtem* of *Doctrines* which concern it as a *Sect*. And then what Matter is it that *one* of theſe *Notions* is *antecedent*, and the *other*, *conſequent*? Thus much at leaſt will follow, that there is no *ſubverting* it as a *Society*, without *ſubverting* it alſo as a *Sect*; becauſe thoſe very *Doctrines* which make it a *Sect*, do alſo conſequently oblige it to be a *Society*. For my part, I believe thoſe *Doctrines* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, which all who believe any *Fundamentals* proper to the *Chriſtian* Religion, as *Revealed* by God, do reckon among *Fundamentals*, not to have been revealed for *Speculation* only, but purpoſely to oblige Men to *unite* in it as a *Society*. The *Unity* in *Trinity*, which is the principal thing inſiſted on in the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, as *revealed* in the Scripture, was purpoſely to let Men ſee the *Extent* of the *Myſtical Union* to which they were intitled by the *External Union* with the *viſible Church*, that by partaking in the *Orthodox Communion*, the Κοινωνία mentioned by St. *John*, they had alſo a Κοινωνία with the *Father* and the *Son*, 1 *John* 1. 3. For it was manifeſt they muſt alſo partake of the *Spirit*, becauſe he who had not *the Spirit of Chriſt was none of his*. It was therefore ſuppoſed, that by partaking of the *Trinity* we are made one *Myſtically*, and that by being *united viſibly* to the *Church*, we are intitled to that *Myſtical Union*. So whoever is united *viſibly* to the *Church*, is thereby, if he be not wanting to himſelf in due Conditions, united alſo *Myſtically* to the *Trinity*; and that whoever is *divided* externally from the *Church*, is thereby alſo *diſ-united* from this *Communion* and *Union* with the *Trinity*. And what more *prevailing Inducements* could be thought of to oblige Men to keep in a *Society*? So alſo the deſign of the *Incarnation* was, by *Chriſt*'s taking upon him our *Body* and our *Fleſh*, to make *us* alſo *one Body* and *one Fleſh* with *Him*, thereby to entitle our *Bodies* to a *Reſurrection*; but then our being *one Body* and *one Fleſh* with Him, depended on our being *Members* of the *Church*, which is called *his Body*, *his Fleſh*, *his Bones*. We were to be *Baptized* into this *one Body*, and become *one Body*, by partaking of *one Bread*. Which plainly ſhew that all the *Benefits* of the *Incarnation* are derived to us by our partaking of the *Sacraments*, and therefore by our *adhering* inſeparably to them who alone are *authorized* by God to *adminiſter* them. Thus plain it is that

thoſe very *Fundamentals* of our revealed Religion, as revealed, are revealed and deſigned for this purpoſe of making the *Church* a *Society*. How can therefore our Adverſaries make theſe Doctrines *Fundamental*, if this be not *Fundamental* alſo, that the *Church* was by God deſigned to be a *Society*?

This at leaſt is certain, that we are intitled to all the Benefits of our Religion, by our owning the *Church* not only as a *Sect*, but as a *Society* alſo; and that tho' we believe all its Doctrines as it is a *Sect*, yet if we be divided from it as a *Society*, that Belief alone will not ſecure us a Title to any of the Benefits of our Religion. *Excommunicates*, however Orthodox in their Opinions, were never ſuppos'd, in the Diſcipline of the Church, to have any actual Title to the Benefits of Religion, if they perſiſted wilfully in that State of *Excommunication*. The ſame is to be obſerved concerning the Caſe of *Schiſmaticks*, on the Principles of the early Age of St. *Cyprian*. Hence therefore it appears, that this Notion of the *Church*, as a *Society*, whatever it be in its ſelf, is at leaſt Fundamental as to us, in order to our partaking of any of the Benefits of Religion: That is, indeed it is Fundamental to all intents and purpoſes that we can think worthy our Enquiry. Without this, the other Notions, if any be, will never be beneficial to us. So that whatever thoſe other Notions may be, in order of *Reaſoning*; yet this Notion of the *Church*, as a *Society*, muſt be Fundamental to them in order to their being beneficial; *that is*, as far as we have any reaſon to concern our ſelves for them. Theſe things ought certainly to be taken for Fundamental, as to the *Diſcipline* and *Cenſures* of the Church. She ought certainly to be moſt concerned for thoſe things that are moſt influential on the Intereſts of Souls; and thoſe are ſo whoſe Belief is moſt beneficial, and their Diſ-belief moſt hurtful to thoſe moſt valuable Intereſts. I cannot therefore ſee why ſhe ſhould not think Doctrines of this kind Fundamental, and reckon them among thoſe Fundamentals on which ſhe ought to lay out her principal Care. If therefore ſhe ought to excommunicate for any Errors at all, certainly ſhe ought in the firſt place to do it for Errors ſo deſtructive of all Obligation to her Communion it ſelf, and of her Authority of Excommunicating; *that is*, indeed ſo deſtructive to all that *Power* ſhe has either for the Preſervation of *Truth*, or the Prohibition of *Error* in general. And if ſhe ought not to inflict her *Cenſures*, at leaſt theſe higheſt of them, for any Errors but thoſe which are Fundamental; it will plainly

plainly follow, that Errors of this kind must be reckoned for Fundamental ones. Our Adversaries would have Errors in Fundamentals published, and punished as a *Spiritual* Crime, by a purely *Spiritual* Authority; but they do not, in the mean time, seem to be aware how Fundamental this very Notion of the *Church*, as a distinct and spiritual *Society*, is to its having any *Authority*, or *Power*, to punish so much as Spiritually. All they can do as a *Sect*, is only to reason with *Hereticks* concerning their *Errors*; and all the *Means* to reduce them are those reasons which can no farther prevail with them than as they may seem convictive in the Judgment of the *Hereticks* themselves. But on that account they stand on even Terms with the *Hereticks*, whose *Reasons* ought also to take place with the *Ecclesiasticks*, so far as they are also in Conscience convinced by them. A true *Authority*, and a *Power* of punishing refractory Persons, by *excluding* from *Communion*, do Fundamentally suppose a spiritual *Society* over which they are to exercise this Authority, and from which Delinquents are to be excluded by spiritual *Censures* and *Excommunications*. How can they therefore avoid reckoning those *Errors* from being *Fundamental* ones as punishable by a *spiritual Authority*, which ruine Fundamentally that very *Authority* by which such *Errors* are to be punished; which destroy the *Society* on which that *Authority* is grounded *Fundamentally*.

If there be degrees of *Fundamentals*, I should think the Fundamentals concerning the *Church*, as a *Society*, to be of the greatest consequence, and therefore Fundamental in the highest degree. The Church is indeed obliged to keep the σύγχυσις, the ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων. These are the Expressions by which our Adversaries themselves, I believe, conceive the Articles themselves call *Fundamental* to be signified. But she is obliged to keep them as a παραθήκη, as a Trust committed to her. How so? by avoiding *Disputings*, by stopping the Mouths of *Hereticks*, by rebuking them with all *Authority*, by rejecting and avoiding not their *Doctrines* only, but their *Persons* also, when they prove incorrigible. Now these things plainly suppose Governors invested with *Spiritual* Authority, and a *Communion* from whence incurable *Hereticks* are to be rejected. So that in order to the keeping these other *Fundamentals*, the *Church*, as a *Society*, is supposed antecedently as a Condition that alone can qualifie her for having such a *Trust* committed to her. This Notion therefore as antecedent must be Fundamental to those other Fundamentals, and therefore Fundamental in a higher

Heb. 5. 11.
1 *Tim.* 1. 16.
1 *Tim.* 6. 20.

sense

ſenſe than thoſe things can be whoſe Security is ſuperſtructed upon it. And accordingly the Damage of the Publick in ſubverting theſe Notions of the *Church*, as a *Society*, is proportionably greater than that which follows from the denial of other particular Articles which are commonly taken for Fundamental. He that denies one of the other Articles, may yet believe all the reſt, and zealouſly defend them, and that by Principles too, againſt all other *Hereticks*. But he that denies the *Church*, as a *Society*, inveſted with a *ſpiritual Authority*, does as effectually contribute to the Ruine of all the other Fundamentals at once, as he does to the Ruine of a Houſe, who ſubverts the Foundations of it. It brings in *Impunity* for *Hereſie* in general, and ſuffers *Hereticks* ſtill to hope as well in their ſeparate Sects, as if they were in the Orthodox Communion. It leaves them deſtitute of even any Preſumptions that might oblige them to judge in Favour of the Church's Doctrine, as the ſafeſt Error, if it ſhould prove one. It does by this means reduce the trial of the *Cauſe* to the *Reaſons* themſelves, and their native Evidence, and puts it in the Power of aſſuming Men to pretend greater Evidence than either they have, or they really believe. And things being reduced to this paſs, it is more God's Providence, than the Security of Principles, that hinders any *Heretick*, who diſputes any one of the other Articles, from queſtioning all the reſt.

CHAP. III.

That the contrary Doctrine is a Fundamental Error, *and obſtinately aſſerted* Hereſie, *very pernicious to the Church of Chriſt, and to the Aſſertors of it themſelves.*

ST. *Auguſtin* obſerves, that *Schiſms* generally end in *Hereſie*: That is the natural conſequence of *Defending* it, as our Adverſaries do, by *Principles*. A ſingle Act of *Undutifulneſs* to *Superiors* will in courſe paſs away with thoſe who are guilty of it; ſo that Poſterity will not be concerned in it: But when it is defended by *Principles*, it turns into *falſe Doctrine*, and *Doctrine* of that pernicious Conſequence, that the *Church* is obliged to take notice of it,

as

as she will be faithful to her Trust, in securing her *Body* from the like Divisions for the future. Thus the *Donatists* took the first occasion for their *Schism* from the pretended *Personal* Faults of *Cæcilian* and his Ordainers. This, whilst it was a *particular Case*, went no farther than that *particular Schism*: But when it turned into a *general Doctrine*, that *Personal* Faults were sufficient to justifie *Separation*, then it laid a Foundation of *frequent Schisms*, as often as any *Criminals* got into Places of *Trust*, and either *Evidence* was wanting, or *themselves* too powerful to be contested with: Then it concerned Ecclesiastical Governours to *condemn* this Doctrine, that encouraged even Men of *Conscience* to divide designedly and frequently. And when that Doctrine was thus condemned by the *Church*, and was notwithstanding maintained by the *Donatists* as a *Principle* on which they subsisted as an *opposite Communion*, it then became a Character of a *Party* to maintain it, and from that time forward the *Donatists* were reckoned among *Hereticks*, as well as *Schismaticks*: For this was the true Notion of *Heresie* in those Ages, as contradistinct from *Schism*: Both of them supposed a *Division of Communion*, or tended to it. But that *Division* was called *Schism*, which only broke the *Political Union* of the *Society*, without any difference of *Principles*; as when *Thieves* or *Robbers* transgress their Duties without any pretence of *Principles* authorizing them to do so. So whilst *Resentment* alone was the reason that made *Subjects* separate from the *Communion* of their Ecclesiastical Governours, or whilst *Ambition* alone made any to invade the Office of his *Bishop*, and to erect an *opposite Communion*, this was *Schism* properly so called, as contradistinct from *Heresie*. But when the *Schism* is patronized by *Doctrines*, and justified as well done, and consistently with Conscience; such *Divisions*, besides their being *Schismatical*, were *Heretical* also in the sense of the Ancients, and such *Doctrines*, as *Characteristical* of a distinct *Communion*, were properly called *Heresies*. On this account the same *Doctrine* of the original Identity of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* was no *Heresie* in S. *Hierome*, who notwithstanding kept Communion with the *Bishops* of the *Jurisdictions* he lived in; and yet was *Heresie* in *Aerius*, when upon account of that pretended *Identity* he presumed to pay no more Duty to the *Bishops* of the respective *Jurisdictions*, than he would have done to single *Presbyters*. This is the most agreeable account of the *Heresies*, not only in *Philastrius*, but in other more judicious Collectors of *Catalogues* of *Heresies*.

Hereſies. And it is very agreeable with the Notion of that Term among the *Philoſophers*, from whom the *Chriſtians* derived it. All *Notions* that were proper and characteriſtical to particular Schools among them made *Hereſies*, not thoſe which were received in common among them. Anſwerably whereunto thoſe Differences only in *Opinion* made *Hereſies* in the Church, which were the Notes of different Communions, not thoſe which went no farther than Speculation.

I am very well aware how ſurprizing this will be to thoſe who, upon popular Opinions, have uſed to believe no Opinion *Hereſie* that was not againſt Fundamentals. But if they will for a while lay aſide their Prejudices, they will poſſibly find this as ſlightly grounded as many other popular Opinions are. The very diſtinction between *Fundamentals* and *Non-Fundamentals*, is not, that I know of, ever taken notice of by the Primitive Chriſtians, either in the ſame, or in equivalent Terms. And if a Perſon will needs make a *Breach* on account of an *Opinion*, it rather aggravates than diminiſhes his Guilt, that the Opinion is of little conſequence: His own *Will* is more concerned in it; *that is*, his *deſire*; and he is therefore more a *Heretick*, and, as *Heretick* were, more *ſelf-condemned*, *Tit.* 3. 2. if, even in his own Opinion, the Matter for which he ſeparates be not of any conſiderable Importance. Even a *Truth*, and a *Truth* that has great Evidence of its being ſo, may make a *Hereſie*, if it be no way conducive nor diſadvantageous to the good of Souls; and yet the Perſon who maintains it will by no means endure Communion with thoſe who are of another Mind. He might have more preſence of *Zeal*, tho' Miſtaken, if the Miſtake on the Church's ſide did indeed concern Souls, and ſeemed, at leaſt, of dangerous conſequence to them. When he has not even *that* to pretend for himſelf, who can impute his breaking on ſuch accounts to any other Original than an aſſuming *Imperiouſneſs* of Temper, and a love of *Contention*, which we generally acknowledge to be the principal Ingredients of *Hereſie*? Certain it is, that ſuch a *Breach* for *Opinion*, tho' true, yet of no conſequence, is highly culpable, and deſtructive to that *Unity* which Chriſt deſigned for his Church; and the more culpable for that very reaſon, that the *Opinion* is of little conſequence. Yet it cannot properly be called *Schiſm*, which is only a *Breach*, like thoſe which fall out frequently in Secular Affairs, when Men fall into Parties, on account of a Temper ungovernable, or ambitious, without any proper difference

of *Opinion* and *Doctrine*. And it being no *Schism*, what can we call it in the Discipline of the Church, if it be not *Heresie*?

These *Opinions* therefore which are not otherwise *Heretical* on account of the *Nature* of the *Opinions* themselves, do then begin to be *Heretical* when they begin to be characteristical of *distinct Communions*. And that they do, not only when Men designedly separate from others on that very account, because they are not of the same *Opinions*; but also when they venture on such Practices on account of their singular *Opinions*, wherein others cannot communicate with them, for that very reason because they cannot join with them in those their singular *Opinions*. Then plainly the differing in such *Opinions*, makes a difference of *Communion* unavoidable; and therefore the *Opinions* themselves, in such a Case as this is, are *Signals* of different *Communions*, which will come under the charge of *Heresie*, as contradistinct from *Schism*, in the Notion now described of the Primitive Church. Thus, had S. *Hierome* proceeded as far as *Aerius* in the Practice of his Opinion concerning the Original *Identity* of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, and had thereupon broken himself off from his *Duty* to the Bishop of the Diocese, and by that means either made or countenanced a *Schism*, which he had never countenanced but on account of this Doctrine of his which he held in Common with the *Aerians*, that Doctrine had been *Heresie* in him, as well as the *Aerians*. So also Opiuions do then begin to be Treasonable, when they are actually productive of Treasonable Actions. Thus *Latitudinarian* Opinions in the *Church* do always weaken or dissolve the *Obligation* in *Conscience* to maintain the *Church*, as a *Society*, in a time of *Persecution*, from the *Civil Magistrate*; yet till that Case fall out, and when *Interest* lies on the *Church*'s side, they often still keep one *Communion* who are for such Opinions, and may continue in it while there are any other Inducements to keep them in it besides those of *Conscience*. Only it may perhaps be fit to be consider'd, whether it be prudent to trust such Persons with the Management of the *Government* of the *Church*, whohave no Obligation of *Principles* or *Conscience* to maintain it as an *independent Society*, or to suffer for it; *that is*, indeed who are never likely to maintain it in that very Case which was most in our *Saviour*'s and the *Apostles* View; *that is*, of a *Persecution*. But when they actually divide that Communion which they were never obliged in Conscience to maintain, if they took the utmost Liberty their *Latitudinarian Principles* would afford them; and when their lax

lax Principles are the very grounds of their dividing the Communion without any remorse of Conscience for doing so; when they are hereby emboldned to do those things which inevitably cause a Breach from those who cannot follow them in these very Principles. This is the Case wherein these Principles are Characters of a *distinct Communion*; and therefore, by the *Reasoning* now mentioned, become *Heretical:* Especially the Principles being withall false, not only in the Opinion of those from whom they have divided themselves, but also of our earliest purest Ancestors, even those of the Apostolical Age it self.

Yet I deny not but that in this Case of *Heresie*, there is also regard to be had to the Momentousness of the Opinion it self. Whoever sets up or abets a Communion opposite to that of the Church, on account of *Opinions*, is, as I have shewn, in the Judgment of the Primitive Church, an *Heretick*; and is the more, not the less so, if the *Opinions* be also frivolous. But for such Opinions the Church would never have driven him out of her own Communion, if himself had been pleased to have continued in it. Her *Judiciary Censures* ought, no doubt, to be confined to Opinions Fundamental and of great Importance; especially if an internal Assent be required, and that under pain of *Excommunication*.

CHAP. IV.

That the Church of Christ *is a* Society *independent on any of the Powers of the World; and its* Spiritual Rights, *derived immediately from a higher Authority, subject to none of them, according to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in the earliest Ages.*

EVEN in the Age of St. *Cyprian* (which is the ancientest we know of that an *Anti-Bishop* was set up against a Bishop in the same See) it is, 1*st*, very notorious, that they then owned no such Power of the Secular Magistrate to deprive Bishops of their purely Spiritual Power; and that the *Church*, as a *Society* distinct

from the *State*, ſubſiſted on their not owning it, even as to a Deprivation of their particular *Diſtricts* and *Juriſdictions*. It is notorious, and as notorious as any one Tradition of the Catholick Church in thoſe Ages, (not excepting that of the Canon of the *New Teſtament* it ſelf) that Chriſtians then, and not only then, but in all the former Perſecutions that had been from the times of the Apoſtles to that very Age, did own themſelves bound to adhere to their Biſhops, when it was notorious withall, that thoſe Biſhops were ſet up and maintained againſt the Conſent of the Civil Magiſtrate. It is as notorious alſo, that this Adherence of theirs was not only Matter of Fact, (which is all our Adverſaries pretend here) but a Duty owned by them, as obliging in Conſcience, and as the reſult of Principles. This appears, not only by the unqueſtionable Sincerity of the Chriſtians of thoſe Ages, who were generouſly influenced by no Conſiderations but thoſe of Conſcience; not only by their Suffering thoſe ſevere Penances impoſed on them, in order to their recovering the Biſhop's Communion, even when the Magiſtrate was againſt him, which no other Conſiderations could recommend, but only thoſe of Conſcience: but from the Principles themſelves inſiſted on in the *Reaſonings* of St. *Cyprian*. Such were theſe: That all hopes of *Pardon of Sin*, of the *Holy Ghoſt*, of *Eternal Life on Performance of Duty*, were confined to the viſible Communion of the Church; that their viſible Communion with the Church could not appear but by their viſible Communion with the Biſhop, as the Head of that Church, and the Principle of its Unity; that who that Biſhop was, to whom any particular Perſon owed his Duty, was not then any otherwiſe diſtinguiſhable, but by the viſible Diſtricts in which themſelves lived, and to which he was therefore ſuppoſed to have a Title, whether the Magiſtrate would or no. It is alſo as notorious, that theſe *Reaſonings* were not then the ſenſe of private Perſons, but the received ſenſe of Chriſtians in general, and indeed Fundamental to that *Catholick Communion*, which was then maintained where-ever there were Chriſtians. Not only every particular Chriſtian of a Dioceſs did thus aſſure himſelf of his Right to Eccleſiaſtical Privileges, by his Communion with the Biſhop of that particular Diſtrict; but he was intitled alſo to Communion with all the other Biſhops of the World, and conſequently with the Catholick Church in general, by the *communicatory Letters* of the Biſhop of his own particular Diſtrict. For it was by the mutual Obligation all Biſhops of the World had to ratifie the Acts of particular Diſtricts,

Diſtricts, that he who was admitted a Member of one Church, was intitled to the Communion of all; and that he who was excluded from one, was excluded from all others alſo; becauſe no other Biſhop could juſtifie his Reception of a Chriſtian of another Juriſdiction to his own Communion, if he had not the *communicatory Letters* of his own Biſhop. Thus it appears, that the Obligation, even of particular *Diſtricts* without Conſent of the *Magiſtrate*, was then *Catholick Doctrine*. Whence it plainly follows, that this *Lay-deprivation*, which is all that can be pretended in the Caſe of our preſent Biſhops, is, in the Principles of the Catholick Church in St. *Cyprian's* Age, a perfect *Nullity*, and conſequently that, in regard to Conſcience at leaſt, our preſent Biſhops are ſtill Biſhops, and Biſhops of thoſe particular Diſtricts, as much as ever; and the Obligations of the Clergy and Laity in thoſe Diſtricts, as obliging to them now as ever.

And it thence follows, *2dly*, that *Anti-Biſhops*, conſecrated in *Diſtricts*, no otherwiſe vacated than by the Power of the Secular Magiſtrate, are, by the Principles of that earlieſt Catholick Church, no Biſhops at all, but divided from the Church. It is plain, that *Novatian* was diſowned as ſoon as ever it appeared that *Cornelius* was canonically ſettled in *Fabian's* Chair before him, and diſowned univerſally, ſo univerſally, that who-ever did not diſown him, was for that very reaſon diſowned himſelf. This is as clear as any Particular mentioned in our Adverſaries Collection. But we do not ſatisfie our ſelves with that. It is alſo further as notorious, that he was diſowned by Principles obliging them in Conſcience to diſown him, and thoſe again not private Opinions, but Principles alſo Fundamental to the Correſpondence then maintained in the whole Catholick Church, as the other were that we mentioned under the former Head. It was then a Principle, that **Secundus* was *Nullus*, which will as much invalidate the Conſecrations of the preſent Anti-Biſhops, as it did that of *Novatian*. This is a Principle ſo univerſally acknowledged, where-ever there can be but one, that it needs no Authorities to recommend it. No Man can convey the ſame thing twice: and therefore if there be two Bonds for the ſame thing to ſeveral Perſons, the ſecond can never be thought obliging, but by ſuppoſing the Invalidity of the firſt. So alſo in all Monarchical Diſtricts, none can ſuppoſe an Anti-Monarch's Title good, till he has ſhewn that the firſt Monarch's Title is not ſo. Thus this Principle needed no Authority, and yet it had all the Authority of the whole Catholick Church of that Age. The whole *Collegium* of Catholick

* *Epiſt.* 55. ad Antonianum, *Edit.* Oxon, *Cypr.*

Catholick Biſhops (that is St. *Cyprian*'s Term) gave their *communicatory Letters*, not to *Novatian*, but *Cornelius*; and received none to their own Communion on the *communicatory Letters* of *Novatian*, but only on thoſe of *Cornelius*. And that upon this ſame common Principle, that *Cornelius* being once *validly* Biſhop of *Rome*, *Novatian* could never be a Biſhop of that ſame Diſtrict without the Death, or Ceſſion, or Deprivation of *Cornelius*; and that ſuppoſing him no Biſhop of that Place to which he was conſecrated, he could be no Biſhop at all. So far they were then from our late Fancy, of a *Biſhop of the Catholick Church* without a *particular Diſtrict*. Had they thought ſo, they might have ratified *Novatian*'s Acts, as a Biſhop, becauſe he had received his Power from Biſhops, tho' not as Biſhop of *Rome*. Comparing the Catholick Church to a *Fanum*, or Temple, he was *Profanus*, as not being in the Temple, nor having a Right to enter into it. Comparing it to the Houſe in which the Paſſover was to be eaten by the *Jews*, he was *Foris*, not in that Houſe, in which alone the Paſſover was to be eaten. Theſe were the Notions of St. *Cyprian*, and were by him and his Colleagues underſtood of the *Catholick Church* in general, when they all ſuppoſed *Novatian* out of the *Catholick* in general, by being out of that particular Church of *Rome*, of which he had formerly been a Member. Juſt as in ordinary Excommunications, they alſo always ſuppoſed, that he who was by any Act of obliging Authority deprived of his Right to his own particular Church, had alſo loſt his Right thereby to all the particular Churches in the World. And they alſo ſuppoſed *Novatian* to have caſt himſelf out of his own Body, by aſſuming to himſelf the Name of a *Head* of that Body, which already had a Head, and could have no more than one. And theſe Notions, and this Language of St. *Cyprian*, were ſuppoſed and owned univerſally by the whole Body of the Catholick Biſhops of his Time, when they acted conſequently to them, and took them for the Meaſures, by which they either granted or refuſed their own Communion. Nor is it to be thought ſtrange, that theſe Notions ſhould be received, and received univerſally, not as the Opinions of private Perſons, but as the publick Doctrine, and Fundamental to the Catholick Communion, as practiſed not only in that early Age of St. *Cyprian*, but as derived from the Apoſtles themſelves, and the very firſt Originals of Chriſtianity: For theſe were not, (as private Opinions uſually were) only the reſult of private Reaſonings; they were received as the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, (which were not

as

as new Revelations generally were, ...) from *the like Notions* received among the *Jews*, and among them received not as private Opinions, but as publick Doctrines, and Fundamental to the then practised Sacrifical Communion of the then peculiar People, and only thence deduced (as other things also are, in the Reasonings of the *New Testament*) to the Case of the new *Mystical Peculium*, and their new *Mystical Sacrifices*. The Language of erecting *Altar* against *Altar* in St. *Cyprian*, is derived from the like earlier Language received among the *Jews*,* concerning the *Samaritan Altar* of *Manasses*, against the *Jerusalem Altar* of *Jaddus*, that is, of a *High Priest* against a *High Priest*, when God had appointed but one High Priest in the whole World, and him only at *Jerusalem*. And it is also plain, that the Body of the *Jews* did look on such Schismatical High Priests, and all their Communicants, as cut off from the Body of their *Peculium*, and consequently from all their publick Sacrifices, and all the Privileges consequent to them. Why should we therefore think it strange, that the Apostolical Christians should have the like Opinion of them, who set up themselves as opposite Heads of their Mystical Sacrifices?

* *V.* Discourse of one Altar, &c. Edit. Lond. 1683. 8°.

But this is not all. It is further as notorious, 3*dly*, that all who any way professed themselves *one with Novatian*, were for that very *Reason* of their doing so, taken for divided from the Catholick Church, as well as he was with whom they were united. Here also the reason was very evident, that he who professed, and, by publick Profession, made himself one with a Person divided, must, by the same Analogy of Interpretation, profess himself divided, and, by that very Profession, actually divide himself also, by making himself one with the Person supposed to be divided. Nor was this reason more evident, than universally acknowledged in the Discipline of that Age. All such Uniters with the Schismatick were refused to be admitted to Communion, not by particular Bishops only, (as the Case would have been if the Opinion had been singular) but by all the Bishops of one Communion in the World.

St. *Cyp.* Epist. 43. Edit. Oxon.

Not only so: But it is also as notorious, 4*thly*, from the Practice and Discipline of that Age, that all whom they looked upon as united with *Novatian*, they consequently looked on as divided from themselves: To be sure, in the first place, those who had any hand in his pretended Consecration, which were principally and particularly reflected on by *Cornelius*, in his Epistle to *Fabius* of *Antioch*. Nor would his People be receiv'd to Communion by any Catholick Bishop

Biſhop on the *communicatory Letters* of *Novatian*; and they could expect none from *Cornelius* whilſt they were divided from him. Thus all his Subjects came to be involved as well as himſelf. But that which was higheſt of all was, that even Biſhops were ſuppoſed to have divided themſelves from their Brethren, if they communicated with him; *that is*, if, according to the cuſtom of that Age, they either gave *communicatory Letters* to him, or receiv'd any to their own Communion on the like *communicatory Letters* receiv'd from him. This appear'd plainly in the Caſe of *Martian* of *Arles*, who was on this very account denied the *communicatory Letters* of his Brethren; and would, no doubt, have appeared alſo in the Caſe of *Fabius* of *Antioch*, if he had proceeded ſo far. And this does plainly ſuppoſe, that ſuch Biſhops alſo had cut themſelves off from *Catholick Communion* by their own Act. And by this means it alſo appeared to have been more than a private Opinion in that Age, when even no Biſhop could be permitted in the Communion of his Brethren, if he diſſented from them in this particular. Thus, to make *Application* to our preſent Caſe, all the Biſhops will be involved, who communicate either with the *Principal Schiſmaticks*, or the *Schiſmatical Conſecrators*. And this will alſo take in, by the ſame Principles, all Communicants with ſuch Biſhops. For when the Biſhop was refuſed Communion, the Effect of ſuch refuſal was, that none ſhould thence-forwards expect to be received to the Communion of thoſe who had refuſed him on his *communicatory Letters*; and no other *communicatory Letters* could be hoped for whilſt they continued in Communion with him.

And then, 5*thly*, it is alſo as notorious, on the ſame Principles of St. *Cyprian*'s Age, that ſuch *Schiſm* from the viſible Communion of the Catholick Church, was alſo ſuppoſed to deprive the Perſon ſo divided of all the inviſible Benefits of *Church Communion*. God was ſuppoſed obliged to ratifie in Heaven, what was done by thoſe whom he authorized to repreſent Him on Earth. He avenged the Contempts of his Miniſters, and would not be a Father to thoſe who would not own his Church for their Mother, by paying her a Filial reſpect. They were not to expect any Pardon of their Sins. They could not hope for the Holy Ghoſt, who diſſolved the Unity of the Spirit: They were uncapable of the Crown of Martyrdom, whatever they ſuffered in the State of Separation. This is the reſult of many of St. *Cyprian*'s Diſcourſes on this Argument. And indeed it is very agreeable with the Deſign of God, that they who

V. Cypr. de Unitate Eccl. *Ep.* 49. *Edit.* Ox. *Ep.* 52, 54, 55.

cut

cut themſelves off from the *Peculium*, ſhould, by their doing ſo, loſe all their pretenſions to the Rights and Privileges of it. Not only ſo, but that they ſhould alſo incurr all the Miſchiefs to which they were ſuppoſed liable, who had loſt their Right of being Members of the peculiar People. Accordingly as they believed all Perſons, at their firſt Admiſſion into the Church, to be turned from Darkneſs to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God; ſo upon their leaving the Church, or their being caſt out of it by the judicial act of their Superiors, they were ſuppoſed to return into the State of Heathens, to loſe the Protection of thoſe good Spirits who miniſter only to the Heirs of Salvation, and again to relapſe into their former condition of Darkneſs, and being conſequently obnoxious to be infeſted by the Devil, and his Powers of Darkneſs. And that this was ſo, appeared by ſeveral ordinary Experiments in thoſe earlier Ages, not only of the Apoſtles, but that alſo of St. *Cyprian*, who has many Examples of it in his Book *de Lapſis*. And this *Confinement of the Spiritual Privileges* of the peculiar People to the external Communion of the Church, as it was Fundamental to their Diſcipline, ſo it was rational conſequently to their other Principles. God was not thought obliged to confer thoſe Privileges, but by the Act of thoſe whom Himſelf had authorized to oblige Him. But *Dividers* were ſuppoſed not to belong to that Body to which the Promiſes were made; and ambitious *Intruders* into other Mens Offices could not in any Equity pretend to have their Acts ratified by God, from whom they could not be ſuppoſed to receive any Authority, when they did not receive it by the Rules and Orders of the Society eſtabliſhed by Him. Theſe things were then believed, and believed univerſally. Indeed nothing but an univerſal Belief of them would have maintained that Diſcipline, which was then obſerved in the Church; could have obliged them generally to ſuffer, as they did then, the ſevereſt Inflictions from the Magiſtrate, rather than incurr the much more feared Diſpleaſure of their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors. When we are alſo of the ſame Mind, and alike influenced by Principles and Regard to Conſcience, then indeed, and then alone, we may pretend to be a Poſterity not degenerous from the great Examples of thoſe glorious Anceſtors: Then it will not be in the Power of Acts of Parliament to drive us from our Principles, and bring a Scandal on our Religion: Then where our Biſhops follow Chriſt, we ſhall follow them, and it will not be in the Power of the Worldly Magiſtrate,

or the Gates of Hell it ſelf, to prevail againſt our Church, and to diſſolve the Union between us: Then Magiſtrates themſelves will be more wary of involving Conſciences on occaſion of their little Worldly Politicks; at leaſt they will not pretend Religion, and the Religion of that very Church which ſuffers by them for doing ſo. May we live at length to ſee that happy day! However it will hence appear how impoſſible it will be to excuſe our Adverſaries preſent Caſe from *Schiſm*, if it be tryed by that Antiquity which we do indeed profeſs to imitate and alledge.

Now in this Caſe I am diſcourſing of, I have purpoſely ſelected the Inſtances of St. *Cyprian*'s Age rather than any other, not only becauſe they are the Ancienteſt, indeed the firſt we know of, of one Biſhop's invading another's Chair not vacant; but becauſe we have withall in him the moſt diſtinct account of the Senſe of the Church in his Age of ſuch *Facts*, and of the *Principles* on which they proceeded in condemning them. He had occaſion given him to be ſo diſtinct by *two Schiſms*, one of his own Church in *Carthage*, where *Feliciſſimus* was ſet up againſt himſelf; another (that I have principally inſiſted on) of *Novatian*, ſet up againſt *Cornelius* in *Rome*. On theſe Occaſions he has written one juſt *Diſcourſe*, beſides ſeveral *Epiſtles*. But theſe Principles were not ſingular and proper to that Age; they deſcended lower, and are inſiſted on by *Optatus* and St. *Auguſtine* in their Diſputes with the *Donatiſts*, whenever they diſpute the Queſtion of their *Schiſm*, without relation to their particular Opinions.

We have here given them the ſenſe of the Church, in an Age wherein her Teſtimony is every way unexceptionable, wherein ſhe had certain means of knowing the Truth, and withall valued it as it deſerved. Even there we find the Principles now mentioned univerſally received, and univerſally received as the Grounds of that univerſal Catholick Communion, which ſhe had received by an uninterrupted Tradition from the Apoſtles to that very Time. Even there, I ſay, we find them received, where nothing could have been received univerſally that had been an *Innovation*. In ſo ſhort a time it was hard to bring in Variations from the Primitive Rule, and harder yet, that all the Churches could have been unanimous in them, if they had been Variations, as *Tertullian* reaſons in his *Preſcriptions*; eſpecially when there was no Univerſal Authority received over the whole Catholick Church that could induce them to it. From the Time of *Trajan*, the Succeſſion of our Saviour's Family

Family failed in the Church of *Jerusalem*, to which all particular Churches paid a Deference. From the Time of *Hadrian*, there could be no pretence for that Church above others, when it consisted not of *Jews*, but *Greeks* and *Romans*. What was there therefore that could make them unanimous in Variations, and Variations of such Importance as this had been? They had then no General Councils: And *the absolute Supremacy of particular Bishops in their proper Districts*, is by none maintained more expressly, and more zealously, than by St. *Cyprian*, with particular regard to all other Powers, that in later times have pretended to oblige Bishops; *that is*, to *Councils*, and the Bishop of *Rome*. This *Catholick Communion*, grounded on the common Interest of all the Bishops, to have all their Acts of Discipline in their particular Districts ratified over the whole World, might have brought in other things that were consequential to these common Interests. But there was nothing antecedent that can be imagined, that could have brought in this Catholick Communion of those times, among such a multitude of absolute and independent Societies, as the Churches were then, if it had not been brought in from their very first Originals. And yet these Notions we were speaking of were Fundamental to that Catholick Communion it self, as managed in those earlier Ages.

CHAP. V.

That Intruders, *or* Anti-Bishops, *(by Lay-Authority) cannot be defended but by* Principles fundamentally destructive *of the Church, as a Society distinct from the State, in time of Persecution.*

IF those Errors, that destroy the very *Being* of the Church, as a Society, be Fundamental, I cannot for my part see how such *Anti-Bishops*, and all that own them, can be excused by Principles from Erring fundamentally. Their being Bishops supposes such Doctrines as, if they be once admitted, make it impossible for the Church to subsist as a *Spiritual Society*, whenever the State is pleased to persecute it. They cannot possibly be supposed Bishops of those

Dioceſes to which they are conſecrated, till it firſt be ſuppoſed that their Predeceſſors are validly deprived, and conſequently that the Sees are vacant in Conſcience. If it ſhould prove otherwiſe, the Clergy and Laity of thoſe ſame Juriſdictions will ſtill be obliged in Conſcience, as much as ever, to adhere to their *Canonical Biſhops* till they be Canonically deprived, and to diſown ſuch *Intruders* as are put over them, not only without any Canonical Procedure, but without any Authority alſo that can oblige in Conſcience. The only Principle therefore on which they can pretend that their Rival Biſhops have loſt their Right, as to Conſcience, muſt be the Power that even the *Lay-Magiſtrate* has to deprive Biſhops even with regard to Conſcience. If therefore they will defend their *Schiſm* by Principles, it will be neceſſary that they defend this Principle alſo, without which it is not poſſible that it ſhould ever be defended. They have no *Eccleſiaſtical Judicatory*, juſt or Unjuſt, that they can ſo much as pretend in this Caſe. And the defending this is that which will increaſe their Guilt, and will add to their charge of *Schiſm*, the aggravation of *Hereſie* alſo. For in order to the aſſerting ſuch a Right as this to the Secular Magiſtrate, it will be neceſſary to aſſert that the Authority of the Church, even as to Spirituals, is, in Conſcience, the Right of the Civil Magiſtrate. If it ſhould not be ſo, then the Subjects of the reſpective Dioceſes may ſtill be at liberty in Conſcience to adhere to their deprived Biſhops. And if they may, they muſt, becauſe then all their former Obligations in Conſcience will ſtill hold as obliging as ever: For it is impoſſible that thoſe antecedent Obligations in Conſcience to adhere to their ſpiritual Superiors can be diſ-anulled, or diminiſhed by a Power that can pretend no Right in ſuch Matters with regard to Conſcience. But if we grant this Power to the Magiſtrate, this will perfectly overthrow the Church as a Society diſtinct from the State, and perfectly diſable it to ſubſiſt as a Society in a time of Perſecution. For when the Magiſtrate perſecutes it, it cannot then ſubſiſt as a Society without a Government, and a Government obliging in Conſcience, and not derived from the perſecuting Magiſtrate. But if the Right of that ſpiritual Government be in Conſcience the Magiſtrate's Right, it muſt be an invading the Magiſtrate's Right to pretend to it, when he expreſly forbids it. And if ſo, how can ſpiritual Governours in ſuch a Caſe pretend to it? How can they pretend to a Right that is none of their own, conſiſtently with Conſcience? How can their pretending to it with

ill

ill Conſciences oblige their Subjects to adhere to them on account of Conſcience? Nay, how can it even excuſe them in Conſcience for not adhering rather to him whoſe Right it is ſuppoſed to be, and that even in Conſcience? No *Neceſſity* whatſoever can excuſe a Sin, much leſs lay an Obligation in Conſcience on Subjects to abet it, leaſt of all lay an Obligation on God to ratifie ſuch Acts of Authority as muſt be ſuppoſed no better than Uſurpations. And yet all Acts of Eccleſiaſtical Authority in a time of Perſecution can ſignifie nothing if they be not ſuch as may oblige in Conſcience, and ſuch as God as well as Men is obliged to ratifie. Thus it had been Sin in the *Romans* to ſet up *Cornelius* (as plainly they did) not only without the Conſent, but againſt the Will of *Decius*. It had been Sin in him, and not in him only, but in all the Biſhops of his Age, to pretend to any Diſtricts in the *Roman* Empire. It had been Sin in them to exerciſe Authority in Diſtricts not belonging to them. Thus the Church had been perfectly diſſolved, as a Society at leaſt, within the *Roman* Empire, unleſs we can ſuppoſe a Notion of a Society without Governours, without Diſtricts, without any lawful Exerciſes of Authority. And yet the Biſhops of thoſe Ages never thought themſelves obliged in Conſcience to go out of the *Roman* Empire to retrieve the Power which is pretended to belong to them as Biſhops of the Catholick Church. And very probably it had ſignified nothing to have done ſo. They could have gone into no civilized inhabited Countries, but they muſt have expected Magiſtrates who could pretend to the ſame Right, as well as *Decius*, and who were as much diſpoſed as he to uſe their Right to the Prejudice of the Chriſtian Religion. What therefore would our Adverſaries have adviſed the Chriſtians of thoſe Ages to have preſerved themſelves in a Society? Would they have had them retired into unoccupied Wilderneſſes? But how could they make Societies there where there were no Numbers of Subjects requiſite to make a Society? Plainly therefore, the Catholick Church had then been diſſolved as Societies, if theſe New Principles had been maintained in thoſe earlier Ages. And theſe ſame Principles do ſtill put it as evidently in the Power of the Civil Magiſtrate to diſſolve the Church, as a Society, within his own Dominions. For how can a Church continue a Society where Biſhops are in Conſcience deprived of their Spiritual Authority, and where Subjects are alſo abſolved from their Obligations in Conſcience to obey them? And this is alſo a diſſolving the Catholick Church as to ſuch as live in ſuch

such Dominions, and as to any Benefits they can derive from the Catholick Church also. For Subjects of particular Districts are no otherwise received into the Catholick Church, than as they derive a Right to Communion with all the Churches in the World, by their being admitted Members of the Churches of their particular Districts. And they are also deprived of their Right of Catholick Communion when they are Excommunicated by the lawful Authority of their particular Districts. I cannot therefore see how our Adversaries can excuse themselves herein from Erring fundamentally, if the Church's being a Society be admitted for a Fundamental.

CHAP. VI.

Arguments *and* Objections *against this Doctrine from Instances of Fact, and Publick Good, answered.*

AGAINST this truly Catholick Doctrine two things were opposed by the Adversaries: The one, a Collection of *Eighteen Instances* of Bishops, who being deprived, and not for Heresie, did not insist on their Right, or were not seconded by their Subjects, in the History of 900. Years. Which *way of Reasoning*, he shews, is neither *Conscientious*, nor *Prudent*: For if Matters of Fact so nakedly related, without Evidence of the Principles on which they were acted, be urged as *Precedents* barely because done, and no Opposition against them, it will be impossible to make any thing of such arguing from History. For what History is there that in a Succession of 900. Years does not afford Examples against Examples? And how easie were it for an Historian, by this way of Reasoning, to justifie the Wickedest things that can be? (§. 9.) And in this case are divers circumstances, which not appearing in any of the Instances make them insignificant. §. 10. — 14. Nor do the Instances produced prove the Sense of the Catholick Church, but only of the *Greek*, and especially of *Constantinople*: nor even of that Church in the first and earliest Ages, (§. 15.) but most of modern, barbarous, and divided Ages, §. 22. and in different cases, *Part* 2. §. 1. and the Deprivations, either by Synods, or disagreeable to the Canons

Canons of that very Church, §. 8, 9, 11. and no such Power so much as pretended by the Lay-Magistrate, §. 3. but the Emperors indeavouring to obtain their Wills by Authority of Synods; or by gross Violence murdering, disabling, or banishing the Incumbents.

The other, their great Plea of the *Publick Good*, §. 47. which he well retorts upon them: That the *Eternal Interests of Souls and of Religion* are more to be valued in a Publick Account, than Worldly Politicks: That it is more the *Publick Good of the Church, and of Religion*, that *Subordinations* be preserved, than that any particular Person be made a Bishop by offering Violence to them; That the Glorious *Passive Doctrines* of the Church be maintained in opposition to Worldly Interests, than seem prostituted to serve them; That the *Credit of the Clergy* be maintained, than that they enjoy the Benefits of Worldly Protection; And that the *Independency of that Sacred Function on the State* be asserted, by challenging the Right, than that by yielding the Lay-Power should be owned to have any Power of Depriving us of the Comfort of Sacraments in a time of Persecution: And that this is more for the *Interest of the State*, even of the Civil Magistracy, than what is like to obtain upon the Cession. Even the State cannot subsist without *Obligations of Conscience*, and the *Sacredness of Oaths*; * which can signifie nothing for the Security of any future Government, if they must signifie nothing for the time past. It is not for the Interest of the Publick to secure *ill Titles* in their Possession, and thereby to incourage the Frequency of ill Titles, and frequent Subversions of the Fundamental Constitutions, and all the Publick Miseries that must follow on such changes.

But these things are more largely treated, and very solidly in the *Defence of the Vindication*, upon a farther occasion. For the Adversaries being so home prest with this, that they had little to reply, were forced to seek for *new Arguments*: And first, without any Answer to his Argument, and granting the Proposition of *the Invalidity of Lay-Deprivation*, the Lawfulness of *Submission* in the Ecclesiastical Subjects to Intruders, is only insisted on; and only from other *Later Facts*, and pretence of Peace and Tranquility of the Church. To which it is replied, That such Submission is *Sinful* by the Law of God, makes the Subjects Accomplices in the Injustice, and moreover in the Clergy, on account of their Oaths of canonical Obedience, *&c.* and, That turning the Dispute to *later Facts* draws it from a short and decisive, to a tedious and litigious Issue, with which there is no reason to comply. And concerning the

* This hath respect to w^t he said before of the *Sacred Vows of Canonical Obedience*, for securing that Right and Duty, where no Worldly Power can force them to it; which no other Power in the World can *dispence* with, but that for whose Interest they were imposed, and the dreadful Imprecations implied in them as an Obligation for Performance.

the Case of Abiathar, he shews, That the Fact is not commended in the Scripture as a Precedent; That the Magistrate could not, by the Doctrine of that Age, have any direct Power over the Priesthood; That in the Apostle's Age the Priesthood was expressly owned to be far more Honourable than the Magistracy it self; and, That *Solomon*'s Act was only of Force, and what God had threatned against the House of *Eli*: Nor was *Abiathar* then the High-Priest properly so called, but *Zadoc*, *&c.* Moreover, That *Christian Bishops* are properly Priests, and the *Gospel Priesthood* more noble than that of *Abiathar*; and that these Principles and Inferences were admitted in the Apostolick Age, *&c.* by *Clemens Romanus*, &c.

But the Principal Pretence of all is proposed by another Author; That tho' the Argument holds where the State are Infidels, and so the Church and State distinct Bodies, yet not so where the State professes the Christian Religion: And, That the Benefits of Protection, of Honor and Profit, of Security, and of Assistance, which the Church receives from the State, require in Gratitude a compensation. To which is replied, That more is required for such a Power than meerly being Christian, which gives no Title to any Spiritual Authority; That the same Persons may be of distinct Societies; That the Church's Obligations are more necessary for the Subsisting of the State, than those she receives from the State for hers; That the Benefits also received from her by the State, are greater than what she receives from it; That a Pious Magistrate would not desire such a Recompence, if she could grant it: But it is not in the Power of Ecclesiastical Governours to make such Contract; Nor is it agreeable to the Mind of God that the Church should so incorporate with the State. To which may be added, *That the Catholick Church and particular States are, by order of Divine Providence, of different, unequal, and inconsistent Dimensions: and, That Particular States are many intire, independent Bodies; but all Particular Churches, Members of One great Body, and subject to the Supream and Universal Authority thereof; Nor ought any State, Prince, or Emperor, be admitted or reputed Christian, who will not submit all their Authority to the Authority of Christ in his Kingdom upon Earth; Which being the Chief of all Powers; who-ever resists, resists the Ordinance of God, and shall receive to themselves Damnation*, Rom. 13. 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Authority of the Church of England; *and that the* Authority *of the Primitive* Catholick Church *is greater than that of any Modern* Particular *one, and to be preferred before it.*

'THE last Refuge is *Argumentum ad hominem*; a poor Cause 'indeed that is reduced to that; which tho' tolerable as an 'Adjective with others more substantial, yet cannot stand alone, 'much less support such a Cause as this. *Two things* are alleadged, 'the *Oath of Supremacy*, & *Deprivation of the Bishops in Q.* Elizabeth's 'time for refusing that Oath, for Proof of the Doctrine of the Church 'of *England* in this case. To all this in general our Author oppo-'seth *the Authority of the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church* of 'the Primitive Ages; which the Church of *England* it self admits; 'and, having set out the Objection fully, makes this Reply.

I should most heartily congratulate the Zeal of these Objectors for our Church, were it really such as it is pretended to be. But I can by no means commend any Zeal for any particular modern Church whatsoever, in Opposition to the Catholick Church of the first and purest Ages. We cannot take it for a *Reformation* that differs from that *Church*, which ought to be the *Standard* of *Reformation* to all later degenerous Ages, at least in things so essential to the Subsistence and Perpetuity of the Church, as these are which concern the *Independence* of the *Sacred*, on the *Civil* Authority. Nor is it for the *Honor* of our dear Mother to own her *Deviation*, in things of so great Importance, from the Primitive Rule; much less to pretend her Precedent for over-ruling an Authority so much greater than hers, so much nearer the Originals, so much more Universal, so much less capable of Corruption, or of Agreement in any Point that had been really a Corruption. It is impossible that ever the present Breaches of the Church can be reconciled, if no particular Churches must ever allow themselves the Liberty of Varying from what has actually been received by them, since the Ages of Divisions, the very Reception thereof having proved the Cause of those Divisions. If therefore our modern Churches will

ever expect to be again united, it must be by *Acknowledgment of Errors in particular Churches*, at least in such things as have made the Differences, and which (whilst they are believed) must make them irreconcilable. Such things could never proceed from Christ, who designing his whole Church for *One Body*, and *One Communion*, could never teach Doctrines inconsistent with such Unity, and destructive of Communion. And why should a Church, such as ours is, which acknowledges her self *Fallible*, be too pertinacious in not acknowledging Mistakes in her self, when the Differences, even between Churches, which cannot all pretend to be in the Right whilst they differ, and differ so greatly from each other, are a manifest *Demonstration of Errors* in Authorities, as great as her own? Nor can any such acknowledgments of actual Errors be prejudicial to Authority, where the Decisions of the Authority are to be overruled not by private Judgments, but by a greater Authority. And if any Authority be admitted as competent for arbitrating the present Differences of Communion between our modern Churches, I know none that can so fairly pretend to it, as that of the *Primitive Catholick Church*. Besides the other Advantages she had for knowing the *Primitive Doctrines* above any Modern ones whatsoever, she has withall those Advantages for a fair Decision, which recommend Arbitrators. She knew none of their Differences, nor dividing Opinions, and therefore cannot be suspected of Partiality. And it was withall an Argument of her being constituted agreeably to the Mind of her blessed Lord, that she was so perfectly one Communion as he designed her. And the Acquiescence of particular Churches in her Decision, is easier and less mortifying than it would be to any other Arbitrator. To return to her, is indeed no other than to return to what themselves were formerly before their Divisions, or dividing Principles. So that indeed, for modern Churches to be determined by Antiquity, is really no other than to make themselves, in their purest, uncorruptest Condition, Judges of their own Case, when they have not the like Security against Impurities and Corruptions. I cannot understand therefore how, even on account of Authority, our late Brethren can excuse their pretended Zeal for even our Common Mother, the *Church of England*, when they presume to oppose her Authority to that of the *Catholick Church*, and of the Catholick Church in the first and purest Ages. I am sure we have been used to commend her for her Deference to Antiquity, and to have the better Opinion of any thing in her Constitution, as it was most agreeable to the Pattern of the Primitive Catholick Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Arch-Bishop Cranmer's *Opinion perfectly destructive of all Spiritual Authority, and his* Authority *in these matters none at all.*

'FOR more *particular* Answer, he *first* shews the Author and 'Original, and so the Novelty, of these pernicious Opinions 'in *England*; and then answers to both the Allegations aforesaid: 'the first not being very long, and therefore recited in his own 'Words at length, is as followeth:

In *Henry* the *Eighth*'s time, under whom the *Oath of Supremacy* was first introduced, the Invasions of the *Sacred Power* were most manifest. Yet so that even then they appear to have been *Innovations* and *Invasions*. But who can wonder at his Success, considering the violent ways used by him? So many executed by him for refusing the *Oath*? The whole Body of the *Clergy* brought under a *Premunire*, (for doing no more than himself had done, in owning the *Legatine* Power of Cardinal *Wolsey*) and fined for it, and forced to Submissions very different from the sense of the Majority of them? He did indeed pretend to be advised by some of the Ecclesiasticks, as appears from several of their Papers still preserved. But they were only *some few selected* by himself, never fairly permitted to a freedom and majority of Suffrages. And when even those few had given their Opinion, yet still he reserved the Judgment of their Reasons to himself. And to shew how far he was from being indifferent, those of them who were most open in betraying the *Rights of their own Function*, were accordingly advanced to the higher degrees in his Favour, and were entrusted with the Management of Ecclesiastical Affairs. None had a greater share in his Ecclesiastical Councils than Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*. Nor is there any who, upon all the Questions proposed, wherein Ecclesiastical Power was concerned, does more constantly side with the King's imperious Humour against *the true Rights of his own Order*. He allows the King the Rights even of *Preaching the Word*, and *Administring the Sacraments*, and allows neither of them to the Ecclesiasticks, any further than as they derived them from the Prince's *Lay-Commissions*. He

permitted indeed their *Consecrations*, as he had found them, by those of their own Order; but derives nothing of their Power from those Consecrations. He makes the *Ceremonies of Consecration* indifferent things, no way concerned in conveying the Spiritual Power. That he derives wholly from their *Lay-Deputation*. He gives them a Power of *Preaching the Word*, and *Administring the Sacraments*, where the Lay-Powers allow it, and he allows them neither where the Secular Magistrate forbids them. They must *admit* whom the Laws oblige them to admit, and they must not *excommunicate* any whom the Secular Laws take into their Protection. The *Magistrate*, notwithstanding his being a Lay-Man, may perform these Offices himself, if he pleased. And the *Ecclesiasticks*, notwithstanding their Consecration, are not by him permitted to perform them, unless the Magistrate be pleased to give them leave. Nay, so far he proceeds in his *Flattery of the Civil Magistrate*, that he allows no more *Gifts of the Holy Ghost*, in the *Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*, than in the collation of any Civil Office. Even in the *Apostles* themselves, he rather excuses than commends all the Exercise of their Spiritual Authority, as necessitated to it by the Exigency of their present Circumstances. As if any Necessity could excuse Usurpation. As if any Exercise of a Power not belonging to them could have been seconded by so visible manifestations of God himself, as that was which was exercised by the Apostles. Yet even their Authority he makes perfectly precarious. He owns no Obligation on the Consciences of the Christians of those times to obey even the Apostles themselves, but ascribes their Obedience then wholly to their good Will, so as to leave it to their own Liberty, whether they would be subject or no. And why so? Only because the Apostles had no Civil Empire. This wholly resolves all Obligation of Conscience into Civil Empire, and makes it impossible for the Church to subsist as a Society, and a Communion, without the Support of the Civil Magistrate. Accordingly the same Archbishop *Cranmer* took out a *Patent* for his Episcopal Power, *preserved by Bishop *Burnet*, full of a Style so pernicious to Ecclesiastical Authority. He there acknowledges all sort of *Jurisdiction*, as well *Ecclesiastical* as *Civil*, *to have flowed originally from the Regal Power, as from a Supream Head, and as a Fountain and Spring of all Magistracy within his own Kingdom.* He says, *they who had exercised this Jurisdiction formerly*, (for which he took out this Patent) *had done it only* PRECARIO, and that *they ought with grateful Minds to acknowledge*

* And another before from King *Henry*, long before *Bonner* was Bishop: from which, and from the Composure, it is plain who was the Projector.

ledge this Favour derived from the King's Liberality and Indulgence, and that accordingly they ought to yield whenever the King thought fit to require it from them. And to shew what Particulars of Ecclesiastical Power he meant, his Patent instances the Power of *Ordering Presbyters*, and of *Ecclesiastical Coercion*, meaning (no doubt) that of *Excommunication*. Nay further, the same Patent gives him a Power of Executing, by the King's Authority, those very things which were known to have been committed to him by God himself in the Scriptures, *per & ultra ea quæ tibi ex Sacris Literis divinitus commissa esse dignoscuntur.* By which we understand, that *no Branch of Spiritual Power whatsoever was excepted.* Yet all this Grant was to last no longer than the King's Pleasure. I know not what the Lay-Encroachers themselves can desire more. Here is so little Security for the Church's subsisting, when the Secular Laws discountenance her, as that she is not allowed the same Liberty that other Subjects have, of pleading the Secular Laws already made in favour of her; but is left exposed to the Arbitrary Pleasure of the Prince, which is thought hard in the case of other Subjects. This Yoke the Politicians have lately imposed on the *Church of Scotland*: GOD, in his good time, release her from it.

I have often wondred how the most learned Bishop *Stillingfleet*, who first published the fore-mentioned Papers, as far as they concerned Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*, could think them consistent with his own Principles: They are so perfectly contradictory to his Discourse concerning *the Power of Excommunication* subjoined in the *Second Edition* of the *Irenicum*, and indeed to the Doctrine of the *Irenicum* it self, as far as it was consistent with it self, or with any one Hypothesis. For sometimes he seems to doubt whether there can be any *Power* properly so called without *Coercion*, or any *Coercion* without *external Force*. As if indeed the Fears of the future Mischiefs attending Exclusion from the *Privileges* of *Church Communion* had not been, in the purest Ages of the Christian Religion, more properly *Coercive*, than the fear of any Evils that were in the Power of the Secular Magistrate. It is certain, that good Christians then chose rather to suffer any thing the Magistrate could inflict, than *Excommunication*. But I more admire, that such a *Betrayer of Ecclesiastical Rights* should, by our Ecclesiastical Historian of the *Reformation*, be proposed as the *Hero* of his times, and as Exemplary to such as might, in his Opinion, deserve the Name of Heroes still. Yet he calls it a *strange Commission* in Bishop *Bonner*, when he took out a Commission from the King, as to his Spirituals, conceived in the

the same terms with that of *Cranmer*, in the Particulars now mentioned. He grants that * *Bonner*'s Inducement to take out that Commission was, that it was observed, that *Cranmer*'s great Interest in the King was chiefly grounded on some Opinions he had of the Ecclesiastical Officers being as much subject to the King as all other Civil Officers were. Yet *Cranmer* was to be excused, because that if he followed that Opinion at all, it was *out of Conscience*. Why he should doubt, whether he was of that Opinion, I cannot guess, when himself has published those very Papers of the learned Bishop *Stillingfleet*, wherein Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* does so plainly own himself of that Opinion; when he has also published *Cranmer*'s own Commission to the same purpose. As little Reason I can see why he should say, that *Cranmer* was once of that Opinion, as if he had afterwards retracted it. The Papers upon the Consult were written in *Henry* the *Eighth*'s time, in the Year 1540. And then, even by the Bishop's Observation, the Change of his Opinion had lost his Interest with the King, if his Interest had been grounded on that Opinion. But *Cranmer* kept to the same Opinions in the Reign of King *Edward* the *Sixth*. Then it was he took out his Commission. The young King himself seems to have been of the same Opinion, in his *second Paper of the Bishop's Collections*, which I can ascribe to nothing more probably than to the Instructions of his God-Father. Nor does it appear the Arch-Bishop chang'd his Mind afterwards. The only thing insisted on by our Historian to prove it, is his subscribing a Book set out soon after, which teaches the contrary. But having already shewn that he still retained the same Opinion in the time of *Edward* the *Sixth*, his Subscription cannot prove any change of his Opinion, but that he complied, whatever his Opinion was, when he found his non-compliance could not hinder the contrary Opinion from being acceptable. But indeed that Book was not so clear in that point that his Subscribing it would argue any change from his former Opinions. But our Historian says, that when *Cranmer* maintained that Opinion, he did it out of Conscience. Perhaps it might have been so. But I am sure it is but an ill Argument to prove it so, that *his Interest in the King was visibly promoted by it*. Yet if he had frequently followed Opinions contrary to Worldly Interest, that, I grant, might have been an Argument, that tho' his Interest was indeed promoted by this Opinion, yet that might have been no Inducement to him why he did imbrace it. But, on the contrary, in the great Actions of his Life, it was the Serviceableness

* It is not only a groundless Charge upon *Bonner*, but false; & disproved both by this, which discovers *Cranmer* the Contriver, and by Evidence of Fact, that he and others took out such Commissions long before *Bonner*. v. *A. Harmar. pag.* 51, 52. The Historian to excuse *Cranmer* cast the *Odium* of it upon *Bonner*, and devised a reason to render it credible.

vicesbleness of his Opinions to the Prince's Designs that principally recommended him. It was notoriously *his Opinion for the Divorce* from Queen *Katherine*, that *first brought him into the Court*, and into the King's Knowledge. Nor is it denied by our Historian that it was so. And in the Case of *Professing Consummation* of Marriage from Bedding, he gave *contrary Judgments* concerning the Marriage with Queen *Katherine*, and that with *Anne* of Cleve, exactly according to the King's Inclinations, and his own Interest in gratifying them. In Queen *Katherine's* Case he allowed it for a good Presumption, but not so in the Case of *Anne of Cleve*. Nay, when the *Protestant Reformation* it self was against *his Interest* with the Prince then in Possession, he *renounced even that*. Nor did he recant that *Renunciation*, at least he gave no publick Signification of his recanting it, till he was affured by Dr. *Cole*, in a Sermon before him at St. *Mary's*, that even his Compliance should avail him nothing for the Saving of his Life. And even in that compleater Collection published by Bishop *Burnet*, none of the other Bishops or Divines consulted on that Occasion is so *perpetually thorough-paced* for the King's Inclinations as he was. Which *Singularity* alone, not only against the Interests, but the Suffrages of his Function, in Favour of *Encroachments*, sufficiently shew how far he was from being Impartial in Questions of this Nature.

'Having given this account of the Worthy Author of this Doctrine, and of his 'Principles, he proceeds farther to shew, That it is not the Interest of the Church, 'that his Authority in these things should be regarded; That neither He, nor the *Duke of Somerset*, did deserve the *Elogies* by our Ecclesiastical Historian bestowed 'upon them, nor the Historian himself any great Commendation or Thanks for his 'mistaken Service in it; That there were *many* in those Reigns, under which the 'Reformation was transacted, who very much *promoted the Reformation*, but *with no good Design* on Religion or Reformation; as K. *Henry* himself, *Cromwell*, and the 'Duke of *Northumberland*, who both at their Executions declared themselves of the *Roman Communion*; That *the part acted by* Cranmer was not really contributive to 'a Reformation; but if his Principles freed the Church from the Tyranny then in being, they naturally introduced a Tyranny of more pernicious Consequence, 'which perfectly destroys the Government of the Church, and thereby dissolves the 'Society, which was the thing to be reformed; That as little reason there is for 'that advantageous Character he gives his other Hero, the Duke of † *Somerset*; 'for he was one that advanced the Sacrilege of the former Reign against *Monasteries*; and in the time of his Protectorship against the *Universities* themselves; and 'wrote a very angry Letter to Bishop *Ridley* for opposing his designed beginnings 'of it in the Suppression of *Clare-Hall*: and how could he reconcile any true Zeal 'for Religion and the Church, with his Sacrilegious Designs (and Practices too) 'against that very Church, whose Communion was owned by him?

† *This is but part of the Sacrilege he was guilty of: and nothing of what he committed in Church Lands and Churches themselves for his own use.*

'After this he shews, from the several Acts of Parliament, how *the Impious Notion* of the *Supremacy* was by degrees settled by that Authority, and continued 'in the Reign of Prince *Edward*, who lived not to the Maturity of Judgment to 'discern *the Falsehood and ill Tendency of those ill Principles* so destructive to all 'Religion, and to the very Fundamentals of the Church, as it is a Society and 'Communion, which had been instilled into him by his God-Father (Cranmer,) 'who was always the most forward Promoter of them.

'And thus far our Author hath proceeded very clearly: but his more particular 'Answer to the two Objections being not fully concluded, but still under Consideration,

'ration, a more compleat account of that is reserved for another Occasion; but 'may be expected ere long. And in the mean time to do him right, and gratifie 'the Reader, we shall conclude with the recital of part of a §. of the *Vindication*, '(which had been altered without his Consent) according to his Mind and 'Original Manuscript. It is § 25. *Pag.* 71. *as followeth.*

Calinicus *by having his Eyes put out was incapacited, and by that Incapacity deprived of his Office without a Judicial Sentence.*

— neither did the Emperor think that his own Authority was alone sufficient for the purpose. The way that was taken to *deprive* him was the same that was usually taken to deprive Emperors, without taking away their Lives, who notwithstanding being the *supream* Authority, were never thought deprivable by any proper Exercise of Authority. That was not by a *Legal Sentence*, but by reducing them to a natural Incapacity for Government, by putting out their *Eyes*. This perfectly disabled them to judge of the *Decrees* to be subscribed by them, without which it was impossible for them to govern. Nor was it ever thought *Undutiful* to deny such Princes Subjection, whatever their *Right* was otherwise, when they once come to be so incapacitated, however they came to be so. No more than if they were Lunatick. Incapacity was alone sufficient for that. And this Incapacity was so notorious, that we never read that even the Princes themselves, who had been thus incapacitated, did ever judge so partially even in their own Case, as to think fit to resume. Such a Case therefore as this did not put it in the Power, even of *partial Subjects*, to deny their Duty where it ought not to have been denied, by judging Incapacities where really there were none. And thus the Law never designs an Office for a Person *incapable* of it, where the *Incapacity* is so notorious as that it cannot be falsly applied by corrupt Interpretations. Thus therefore that Emperor deprived this Patriarch *Callinicus* by putting out his Eyes. Nor was this such a *Maiming* only as had made him at first unfit to be *elected*, but such as *disabled* him to *hold* his *Office*, tho' the Emperor had never taken it from him, however he had come to it by a Disease, or by any other Providence. It was not like *Antigonus's* biting of the Ear of *Hyrcanus*. That only unqualified *Hyrcanus* for holding the *Priesthood* by the particular *Constitution* of the *Jews*, which allowed none for *Priests* who had any such corporal Imperfections. Nor was it like the slitting of the *Nose* of this Emperor *Justinian*. That only deprived him of the τῶν ἄξιον πρόσωπον, the graceful and Majestick *Presence* becoming a Prince; but was still consistent with the Essential Qualifications for Government. But this Blindness perfectly disabled our Patriarch *Callinicus* from ever Exercising any Patriarchal Office, especially that most essential one of our Christian *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, and no Law could ever design to keep an *Office* perpetually, unless by allowing a perpetual unextinguishable *Right* in a Person who is under a perpetual *natural* Incapacity of *Exercising* it. Thus therefore there was no need of a *depriving Sentence* against *Callinicus* when he was under this *Incapacity*, himself could now pretend no *Right* to an *Office* which he could never hope to be able to *exercise*. What Pretence therefore could he have for *Separating* from the *Communion* of *Cyrus*, when himself was *disabled* from *Officiating* in any *Communion*? What pretence could the *Church* have for Questioning the *Ordinations* of *Cyrus*, when his *Rival* was not capable of exercising any *better Ordinations*? But, God be praised, this is none of our present Fathers Case. They are not under any such *Incapacities*.

F I N I S.